

The A. F. of L. is the only labor organization in the world which has a record of success in the field of labor relations. It is the only labor organization in the world which has a record of success in the field of labor relations. It is the only labor organization in the world which has a record of success in the field of labor relations.

It is the only labor organization in the world which has a record of success in the field of labor relations. It is the only labor organization in the world which has a record of success in the field of labor relations. It is the only labor organization in the world which has a record of success in the field of labor relations.

It is the only labor organization in the world which has a record of success in the field of labor relations. It is the only labor organization in the world which has a record of success in the field of labor relations. It is the only labor organization in the world which has a record of success in the field of labor relations.

It is the only labor organization in the world which has a record of success in the field of labor relations. It is the only labor organization in the world which has a record of success in the field of labor relations. It is the only labor organization in the world which has a record of success in the field of labor relations.

It is the only labor organization in the world which has a record of success in the field of labor relations. It is the only labor organization in the world which has a record of success in the field of labor relations. It is the only labor organization in the world which has a record of success in the field of labor relations.

It is the only labor organization in the world which has a record of success in the field of labor relations. It is the only labor organization in the world which has a record of success in the field of labor relations. It is the only labor organization in the world which has a record of success in the field of labor relations.

It is the only labor organization in the world which has a record of success in the field of labor relations. It is the only labor organization in the world which has a record of success in the field of labor relations. It is the only labor organization in the world which has a record of success in the field of labor relations.

It is the only labor organization in the world which has a record of success in the field of labor relations. It is the only labor organization in the world which has a record of success in the field of labor relations. It is the only labor organization in the world which has a record of success in the field of labor relations.

WHOLE NO. 1728

WILLIAM GREEN, President

WASHINGTON, D. C., TUESDAY, MARCH 23, 1944

GEORGE MEANY, Secretary-Treasurer

VOL. 34, NO. 13

FACING THE FACTS

With PHILIP PEARL

What's wrong with the War Department? We'll tell you.

The War Department is not satisfied with running the war effort on the fighting fronts. It wants to run America. The same holds true in a lesser degree, of the Navy Department. The military mind, apparently, can never be satisfied with anything less than absolute power.

That is the big factor behind the continuing drive for enactment of a national service law, which means drafting of labor. No one else wants it. Industry and labor, the civilian leaders of our production and manpower program—all consider a labor draft unnecessary, dangerous and inimical to the interests of the nation. But the War and Navy Departments are insisting upon it.

In wartime it is customary to assume that the War and Navy Departments speak with authority. They should be treated as such. They are not. Nevertheless, it is a mistake to assume that because of superior knowledge and great information the military authorities cannot be guilty of errors in judgment and action.

The Army Not Immune

And we believe it is also a mistake to take the position that in wartime the War and Navy Departments should be immune to criticism. So here goes.

When America became directly involved in this war—and ever before—our nation's role in the conflict was clearly defined by President Roosevelt. He said that this country must demand the annulment of Germany. It was our function, first and foremost, to produce the planes, ships, tanks and supplies with the battle of production. Most of the fighting, it was assumed, would be taken care of by our Allies who had millions of troops trained and in readiness to take the field.

Nevertheless, the War and Navy Departments immediately sought to draft every able-bodied man into the armed services. They took millions. They ever demanded and obtained authority to draft boys of eighteen. They insisted on taking full-time jobs when that meant leaving up home. They never demanding all men under twenty-six who have been deferred because their special skills are indispensable to war industries—even though such action may involve the production of the very arms and munitions the military authorities are demanding labor conscription.

Today, according to British Prime Minister Churchill, the American air force in Britain is greater in size than the American air force in America. Perhaps another million or more are scattered in Africa, the West Indies, South America and in the Pacific.

Nevertheless, our own country still abounds in men in uniform. They choke all trains; they flood the cities. Everywhere one goes they are in evidence in great numbers.

Wasting Manpower

What are these soldiers doing? What are they accomplishing toward winning the war in the shortest possible time? Are they performing a useful function?

The emphasis given among such uninformed persons as ourselves that the War and Navy Departments are wasting a lot of manpower. We can't help feeling that the military authorities are losing sight of the fact that America's primary function in this war is to produce. We can't escape the notion that the War and Navy Departments are figuring on winning this war by all they themselves and that they are proceeding step by step in a drive to maintain all America in a state of martial law.

Somewhat or other, America never did cotton to militarization. We have always managed to restrict our military forces to their own sphere, which, in fact, was fighting. America has never had a military for government by the military. No free people want it.

It seems to us that the War and Navy Departments would do better to attend strictly to the business of fighting and not attempt to run the whole country. They've got a big enough job on their hands to lick Hitler and the Japs without taking on additional worries and responsibilities.

It seems to us that the War Department, especially, cannot afford to divert its energies at this time to the production of the war effort. The Italian campaign and the prolonged delays in launching the promised invasion of Europe from England require undivided concentration. We will win the war a lot sooner if the War Department sticks to the fighting end and ceases to interfere with the production end of the job.

World Social Security Charter

Proposed In New Report To ILO

Philadelphia.—A new international charter of social rights, based on the four Freedoms and designed to encourage lifting of social and labor standards in all countries, will be proposed for consideration at the International Labor Organization at its conference which is to open here today.

The proposed charter goes on to declare that "it is accordingly a responsibility of the International Labor Organization to scrutinize all international economic and financial measures in the light of this fundamental principle." The charter also states that the ILO should endeavor to secure the adoption of the proposed charter by its member states and to see that it is put into effect.

The proposed charter is being presented to the conference as part of a program of action in the social field. It deals with economic and social rights, and is being presented to the conference as part of a program of action in the social field. It deals with economic and social rights, and is being presented to the conference as part of a program of action in the social field.

The proposed charter is being presented to the conference as part of a program of action in the social field. It deals with economic and social rights, and is being presented to the conference as part of a program of action in the social field.

The proposed charter is being presented to the conference as part of a program of action in the social field. It deals with economic and social rights, and is being presented to the conference as part of a program of action in the social field.

The proposed charter is being presented to the conference as part of a program of action in the social field. It deals with economic and social rights, and is being presented to the conference as part of a program of action in the social field.

The proposed charter is being presented to the conference as part of a program of action in the social field. It deals with economic and social rights, and is being presented to the conference as part of a program of action in the social field.

The proposed charter is being presented to the conference as part of a program of action in the social field. It deals with economic and social rights, and is being presented to the conference as part of a program of action in the social field.

The proposed charter is being presented to the conference as part of a program of action in the social field. It deals with economic and social rights, and is being presented to the conference as part of a program of action in the social field.

Labor protests Army's Rejection Of Request To Tell Truth To troops

Washington, D. C.—The War Department rejected organized labor's request that it take the responsibility of keeping American troops accurately and fully informed of labor's record in the home front.

The statement issued by the War Department stated that the request was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

The statement issued by the War Department stated that the request was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

The statement issued by the War Department stated that the request was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

The statement issued by the War Department stated that the request was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

The statement issued by the War Department stated that the request was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

The statement issued by the War Department stated that the request was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

The statement issued by the War Department stated that the request was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

The statement issued by the War Department stated that the request was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

The statement issued by the War Department stated that the request was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

The statement issued by the War Department stated that the request was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

The statement issued by the War Department stated that the request was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

The statement issued by the War Department stated that the request was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

The statement issued by the War Department stated that the request was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

The statement issued by the War Department stated that the request was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

The statement issued by the War Department stated that the request was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

The statement issued by the War Department stated that the request was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

The statement issued by the War Department stated that the request was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

The statement issued by the War Department stated that the request was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

The statement issued by the War Department stated that the request was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

The statement issued by the War Department stated that the request was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

The statement issued by the War Department stated that the request was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

The statement issued by the War Department stated that the request was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

The statement issued by the War Department stated that the request was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

AFI Launches Public Fight In "Little Steel" Formula

Washington, D. C.—After a determined fight by the American Federation of Labor, the National War Labor Board today announced a public hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

Meany To Open WLB Hearing For "Realistic" Wage Adjustments

Washington, D. C.—After a determined fight by the American Federation of Labor, the National War Labor Board today announced a public hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

The hearing will be held before a panel on April 4 to consider the "Little Steel" formula for wage adjustments.

Ludlow insists Labor's War Record Merits Repeal Of Connally-Smith Act

Washington, D. C.—On the basis of a glowing report on labor's record in the war, Ludlow, chairman of the National War Labor Board, today announced that he would recommend the repeal of the Connally-Smith Act, which prohibits strikes during the war.

Ludlow, who was speaking at a hearing on the Connally-Smith Act, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Ludlow, who was speaking at a hearing on the Connally-Smith Act, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Ludlow, who was speaking at a hearing on the Connally-Smith Act, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Ludlow, who was speaking at a hearing on the Connally-Smith Act, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Ludlow, who was speaking at a hearing on the Connally-Smith Act, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Ludlow, who was speaking at a hearing on the Connally-Smith Act, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Ludlow, who was speaking at a hearing on the Connally-Smith Act, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Ludlow, who was speaking at a hearing on the Connally-Smith Act, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Ludlow, who was speaking at a hearing on the Connally-Smith Act, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Ludlow, who was speaking at a hearing on the Connally-Smith Act, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Ludlow, who was speaking at a hearing on the Connally-Smith Act, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Ludlow, who was speaking at a hearing on the Connally-Smith Act, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Ludlow, who was speaking at a hearing on the Connally-Smith Act, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Ludlow, who was speaking at a hearing on the Connally-Smith Act, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Ludlow, who was speaking at a hearing on the Connally-Smith Act, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Ludlow, who was speaking at a hearing on the Connally-Smith Act, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Leiserson Urges Centralization Of Federal War Labor Agencies

Washington, D. C.—Dr. William M. Leiserson, chairman of the National War Labor Board, today urged the centralization of the federal war labor agencies.

Leiserson, who was speaking at a hearing on the centralization of the federal war labor agencies, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Leiserson, who was speaking at a hearing on the centralization of the federal war labor agencies, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Leiserson, who was speaking at a hearing on the centralization of the federal war labor agencies, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Leiserson, who was speaking at a hearing on the centralization of the federal war labor agencies, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Leiserson, who was speaking at a hearing on the centralization of the federal war labor agencies, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Leiserson, who was speaking at a hearing on the centralization of the federal war labor agencies, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Leiserson, who was speaking at a hearing on the centralization of the federal war labor agencies, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Leiserson, who was speaking at a hearing on the centralization of the federal war labor agencies, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Leiserson, who was speaking at a hearing on the centralization of the federal war labor agencies, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Leiserson, who was speaking at a hearing on the centralization of the federal war labor agencies, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Leiserson, who was speaking at a hearing on the centralization of the federal war labor agencies, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Leiserson, who was speaking at a hearing on the centralization of the federal war labor agencies, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Leiserson, who was speaking at a hearing on the centralization of the federal war labor agencies, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Leiserson, who was speaking at a hearing on the centralization of the federal war labor agencies, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Leiserson, who was speaking at a hearing on the centralization of the federal war labor agencies, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

Leiserson, who was speaking at a hearing on the centralization of the federal war labor agencies, said that the act was "not in the least surprising" and that the War Department was "not in a position to give the answer."

AFI Office Workers Win Big Election

Stamford, Conn.—The AFI Office Workers Union won a significant victory in an election at the Yale University, where it defeated the Yale University Employees Association.

The AFI Office Workers Union won a significant victory in an election at the Yale University, where it defeated the Yale University Employees Association.

The AFI Office Workers Union won a significant victory in an election at the Yale University, where it defeated the Yale University Employees Association.

The AFI Office Workers Union won a significant victory in an election at the Yale University, where it defeated the Yale University Employees Association.

The AFI Office Workers Union won a significant victory in an election at the Yale University, where it defeated the Yale University Employees Association.

The AFI Office Workers Union won a significant victory in an election at the Yale University, where it defeated the Yale University Employees Association.

The AFI Office Workers Union won a significant victory in an election at the Yale University, where it defeated the Yale University Employees Association.

The AFI Office Workers Union won a significant victory in an election at the Yale University, where it defeated the Yale University Employees Association.

The AFI Office Workers Union won a significant victory in an election at the Yale University, where it defeated the Yale University Employees Association.

The AFI Office Workers Union won a significant victory in an election at the Yale University, where it defeated the Yale University Employees Association.

The AFI Office Workers Union won a significant victory in an election at the Yale University, where it defeated the Yale University Employees Association.

The AFI Office Workers Union won a significant victory in an election at the Yale University, where it defeated the Yale University Employees Association.

The AFI Office Workers Union won a significant victory in an election at the Yale University, where it defeated the Yale University Employees Association.

The AFI Office Workers Union won a significant victory in an election at the Yale University, where it defeated the Yale University Employees Association.

The AFI Office Workers Union won a significant victory in an election at the Yale University, where it defeated the Yale University Employees Association.

The AFI Office Workers Union won a significant victory in an election at the Yale University, where it defeated the Yale University Employees Association.

The AFI Office Workers Union won a significant victory in an election at the Yale University, where it defeated the Yale University Employees Association.